

Remarks

In the present response, claims 1 – 20 are presented for examination.

I. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102(a)

Claims 1-4, 8, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(a) as being anticipated by US publication 2004/0032430 (Yung). Applicants respectfully argue that these rejections are moot.

Independent claims 1 and 8 recite recitations to an automated storage system having data access drives and transfer robotics. As recited in claim 1, the data access drives perform read or write operations on storage media and the transfer robotics transfer the storage media to the data access drives. Although Yung mentions the words “storage device” and “transferring robotics devices” (example at paragraph [0011]), Yung does not teach an automated storage system wherein drives perform read or write operations on storage media and the transfer robotics transfer the storage media to the data access drives. By contrast, Yung is generally directed to a user interface for biological laboratories, not automated storage systems.

Anticipation under section 102 can be found only if a single reference shows exactly what is claimed (see *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985)). For at least these reasons, independent claims 1 and 8 and their respective dependent claims are allowable over Yung.

Further, claim 1 is amended to recite “receiving user input to change access permissions for hosts to the data access drives and the transfer robotics.” Claim 8 is amended to recite “receiving user input in the application window to change access permissions of hosts to the data access drives and the transfer robotics.” Nowhere does Yung teach or even suggest such recitations.

For a prior art reference to anticipate under section 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference (see *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990)). For at least these reasons, independent claims 1 and 8 and their respective dependent claims are allowable over Yung.

II. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 5-7, 9, 10, and 13-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yung in view of USPN 6,212,606 (Dimitroff). These rejections are traversed.

First, as noted above, the independent claims are directed to automated storage systems. By way of example, independent claim 17 recites system devices that “include drives for reading and writing data to movable storage media received from transfer robotics in a storage system.” By contrast, Yung is generally directed to a user interface for biological laboratories, not automated storage systems.

Second, independent claim 17 recites “receiving user selections from the graphical user interface to edit access permissions of hosts to the drives and the transfer robotics.” Dimitroff discusses access parameters that enable controllers to read and write data to storage units. However, Dimitroff never teaches the **graphical user interface** to receive user input and “edit access permissions of hosts” to drives and transfer robotics. Yung (generally directed to biological laboratories, not automated storage systems) does not cure the deficiencies of Dimitroff.

For at least these reasons, the claims are allowable over Yung in view of Dimitroff.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529